

# **EXHIBIT 95**



Holme Roberts & Owen LLP  
Attorneys at Law

COLORADO SPRINGS

VIA FACSIMILE TO (213) 229-6260

March 19, 2007

BOULDER

Maurice M. Suh, Esq.  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

Re: USADA and Floyd Landis, AAA No. 30 190 00847 06

DENVER

Dear Mr. Suh:

During the hearing on February 22, 2007, before the Panel in this matter, you indicated that Mr. Landis was reserving additional defenses and stated:

LONDON

“And by the way, one of the things that we did, both for time and effort – frankly, because we didn’t want to lay out the entirety of our case out. We didn’t put down every issue that we know exists in our brief. You will see many more when it comes to trial.”

ANGELES

Hearing Tr. (Feb. 22, 2007) at 184:3-8.

MUNICH

This arbitration should not become a trial by surprise. USADA is entitled to know the defenses that Mr. Landis intends to rely upon so that the issues can be addressed in advance of your witness designations. In fact, under Rule 22 of the Supplemental Procedures, one of the purposes of the preliminary hearing is “clarification of the issues and claims” in the proceedings. Furthermore, the hearing will proceed in a more organized fashion if both sides understand in advance the claims and defenses of the other party.

SALT LAKE CITY

Accordingly, for purposes of clarification and mutual understanding, please designate those additional defenses that you referred to during the hearing that you have not disclosed to USADA. In addition, so that we can designate appropriate witnesses and prepare our discovery requests, please clarify whether you intend to offer any defense related to the following specific issues:

SAN FRANCISCO

Richard Young richard.young@hro.com

90 South Cascade Avenue, Suite 1300 Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903-1615 tel 719.473.3800 fax 719.633.1518

#171402 v1

**Holme Roberts & Owen LLP**  
*Attorneys at Law*

Maurice M. Suh, Esq.  
Page 2

1. The collection of samples;
2. Transport of samples (anything between collection of samples and receipt of samples at lab); and
3. Any purported defense (e.g., alcohol consumption, thyroid condition) that place Mr. Landis' medical condition and history at issue;

USADA has always maintained that it only brings a case against an athlete where the facts indicate that the athlete has committed an anti-doping rules violation. Based on USADA's review of the facts at issue here, including all defenses submitted to date, the case against Mr. Landis remains extremely strong. If, however, you have any as-yet undisclosed defenses that you feel raise credible issues, it is not in either party's interest for you to withhold them. Accordingly, if your client is genuinely interested in the truth being revealed and you have reserved any defenses that would aid in that effort, please provide those defenses at your earliest convenience.

We look forward to your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,



Richard Young

cc: Howard Jacobs, Esq. (via facsimile)